

## Utah Regional Haze State Implementation Plan

### Stakeholder Advisory Group

#### Meeting Summary

April 1, 2003

Utah Department of Environmental Quality Building, 168 N. 1950 West in Salt Lake City

MEMBERS PRESENT:	MEMBERS ABSENT:
Paul Barber, Utah Assoc of Energy Users	Rep Ralph Becker
Jeff Burks, Utah Energy Office	Carlos Bracerias, UDOT
Chuck Chappell, Wasatch Front Reg Council	Chris Hockett, USDA Forest Service
David Creer, Utah Trucking Assoc	Sen Pete Knudson
Nina Dougherty, Sierra Club	Mary Risser, National Park Service
Joel Frandsen, Utah State Forester	Reed Searle, Intermountain Power
David George, Rio Tinto	Adrien Taylor, Moab Times-Independent
James Holtkamp	Kathy VanDame, Wasatch Clean Air Coalition
Sen. Paula Julander	John Veranth, U of U Research Professor
Jerry Lewis	
Rep David Ure	OTHERS ATTENDING
Ernie Wessman, PacifiCorp	Dr. Dianne Nielson, Executive Director, DEQ
John Willey, Washington County	Rick Sprott, Director, DAQ
	Cheryl Heying, Planning Branch Mgr, DAQ
	Shawn Kendall, The Kendall Group, Inc.
	Jan Miller, Regional Haze SIP Coordinator, DAQ
	Colleen Delaney, Sr SIP Coordinator, DAQ
	Lynn Menlove, Sr Engineer, DAQ
	John Jenks, New Source Review engineer, DAQ

The Stakeholder Advisory Group met on April 1 from 11:00 am until 2:35 pm.

Dr. Dianne Nielson, executive director of the Department of Environmental Quality, welcomed participants. She noted that this is an unusual and critical process with a regional organization rooted in the West in order to maintain state and tribal authority while supplanting a discussion that would otherwise occur between individual states and EPA.

Rick Sprott, director of the Division of Air Quality, reviewed the charge and introduced Shawn Kendall of The Kendall Group, Inc.

Mr. Kendall explained that his role is to be a resource for stakeholders in the process, in order that DAQ can fill any holes in the SIP process before we get to the formal public hearing process. He noted that this is not a consensus process--we do expect disagreements. He presented a series of slides reviewing the science of visibility and the history of technical and regulatory work toward improving visibility.

Participants discussed various items presented during the day and reviewed the timeline for

development of the SIP. Key feedback from the group included:

- Consider adding Public Scoping Meetings in Richfield, Box Elder, and possibly Price.
- Invitations for the workshops should go to the League of Cities and Towns and Association of Counties
- Participants thought the 308 vs 309 summary slide was good. May be worth more focus
- Break “Science” presentation in half and allow about 5 minutes for it to “soak in”
- Add slide for which states are going 308 or 309 or are undecided
- Add option if state fails to act and EPA FIP’s the state for regional haze
- Develop a 308 rebuttal presentation
- Increase emphasis on Pollution Prevention components
- Strengthen focus to show that GCVTC is equivalent to 308 Reasonable Progress
- Revisit rationale for 309 preference
- Use stakeholders in the public meetings
- Add slides discussing what the program will cost

NEXT MEETING: At the next meeting, stakeholders will hear results of recent technical and policy work, and will review a first draft of the Utah SIP.

Stakeholders chose either May 28 or May 29 as the date for their next meeting. DAQ staff will poll stakeholders who were not able to attend today before selecting the final date.